

**REMARKS**

This communication is intended to supplement our response to Office action mailed 25 July 2003 (the "Office Action").

We have filed a substantive amendment and a response to the Office Action on October 20, 2003; the Examiner has pointed out, however, that the response did not address the rejection of claims 10, 26, 88, and 102. We apologize for the incompleteness of the response, and thank the Examiner for pointing this deficiency to us and granting a one-month period for completing the response. This document is being filed within the one-month period. Therefore, no extension of time fees are due.

Claim 10 depends from base claim 1 and intervening claim 9, and is patentable together with these claims; claims 1 and 9 are patentable for the reasons explained in the response filed on October 20, 2003.

Claim 26 depends from base claim 17 and intervening claim 25, and is patentable together with these claims; claims 17 and 25 are patentable for the reasons explained in the response filed on October 20, 2003.

Claim 88 depends from base claim 81, and is patentable together with claim 81; claim 81 is patentable for the reasons explained in the response filed on October 20, 2003.

Claim 102 depends from base claim 95, and is patentable together with claim 95; claim 95 is patentable for the reasons explained in the response filed on October 20, 2003.



Creation date: 06-01-2004  
Indexing Officer: YINGILA - YOTAKA INGILA  
Team: OIPEBackFileIndexing  
Dossier: 09870210

Legal Date: 04-19-2004

No.	Doccode	Number of pages
1	CTMS	2

Total number of pages: 2

Remarks:

Order of re-scan issued on .....